

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.1 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 349 Southdale Road East (Z-9308/39CD-20501)

- Councillor Squire: Are there any public presentations or does the applicant wish to speak?
- Hi. Good afternoon Mr. Chair. It's, it's Scott Allen from MHBC. I just want to confirm that you can hear me at this point.
- Councillor Squire: Yes, we can hear you loud and clear.
- Scott Allen, MHBC: My apologies. I wasn't sure if I was speaking or not. We are acting on behalf of the applicant and at this time we would like to express our support for the findings and recommendations of the Development Services report prepared by Mr. Meksula. We just wanted to confirm that we agree with the finding that this redevelopment proposal is appropriate to the site, compatible with local development context and supports housing choice in North Longwoods. This finding is also in keeping with the commentary provided in our planning justification report. We'd also like to thank staff for their assistance with this application and with their approval, the applicant intends to proceed with site plan approval and is hoping to initiate site development in the Fall. Thank you for your consideration and I will gladly answer any questions Committee Members may have.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Questions from Committee for the applicant or for staff? There being none is somebody prepared to move the recommendation? Moved by Councillor Lewis, seconded by Councillor Hillier. Any comments or questions? There being none I will call the vote. Oh, sorry. Oh, I'm sorry, there's another person that wishes to speak. I apologize. I thought that was it. Go ahead.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Thank you Mr. Chair. Among Omar is here to speak today.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you.
- Among Omar: Good afternoon. How are you today?
- Councillor Squire: I'm very good. Sorry that I skipped over you. That's our fault so go ahead.
- Among Omar: That's okay. That's alright. It's perfectly okay. How are you guys doing today?
- Councillor Squire: I'm good. Go Habs!
- Among Omar: I do appreciate you giving us the opportunity to voice our concerns. I have a couple here. My backyard is to the west, facing to the west, so the property, the vacant lot is right behind my backyard and my first concern is privacy slash safety. Can you hear me?
- Councillor Squire: Yes. I can hear you and I am writing down your questions.
- Among Omar: Ok. I babysit my grandchildren, both of them under the age of six and most of the time I just let them play in the back yard unattended so I'm very concerned now that there will be condominiums built behind my house. Right now there is just a chain link fence that's maybe four feet high and there is a gate, as well.

I'm very concerned about their safety, my privacy, most of the time I just let them play in the backyard unattended. I was wondering what will happen with the chain link fence, will it be repaired, sorry, not repair, or will something else be built there?

- Councillor Squire: Okay. Did you have any other concerns you wanted me to find out about?
- Amongy Omar: Yes. There's also a tree that it's between the two lots, it's between my backyard and the lot, it's right between the chain link fence is right in the middle of the tree so it's mainly leaning towards the vacant lot land so I was wondering will you be cutting that down?
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Are there any other concerns that you have?
- Amongy Omar: I have one more concern.
- Councillor Squire: Sure.
- Amongy Omar: How many of the trees will you be able to save?
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Alright. Did you want to say anything else while you had the opportunity?
- Amongy Omar: That's about it.
- Councillor Squire: Great. I'll ask your questions; we'll try to get answers. If you stay on you'll be able to hear that. Thank you very much.
- Amongy Omar: Thank you. You're welcome.
- Councillor Squire: Maybe I can go to the applicant. I hope you heard the three questions. The first was privacy and safety between her home which backs onto the development; the tree between her yard and the development site, there's a tree right on the property line and she would like to know what is going to occur with that and the last thing is how many trees are you able to save on the site.
- Scott Allen, MHBC: Thank you Mr. Chair. In response to the first question, there will be a, I believe 1.8 metre tall wood board fence that will be established and that will be addressed through site plan approval. I believe Mr. Meksula's report speaks to that so that matter would be addressed in terms of privacy, there would also be landscaping, tree planting as well adjacent to that fence to have additional privacy so that matter certainly is a concern and we'll investigate it further in site plan approval. Secondly, with respect to trees, there has been a Tree Preservation Plan prepared and several of the trees, the boundary trees are to be preserved. I can't speak specifically to this one but I can speak to the fact that the trees on the northern boundary, the intent is to save those and I apologize, I don't really have the details in front of me but that would be further investigated. The specific tree that Ms. Omar, I believe it is, is speaking to we will certainly investigate that further to see if we can preserve it as well if it happens to be not identified currently in this Tree Preservation Plan for protection.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Does that help you?
- Amongy Omar: Yes. Absolutely it did. Just one more question. The tree that I'm talking about between the two properties I don't know who it belongs to. If it belongs to me or if it belongs to the property.

- Councillor Squire: I think they will. I think they will be able to tell you who owns the tree and I think they'll also be able to tell you what the plans are for the tree and you can always check with our staff for the Planning Committee and we can help you with that.
- Amony Omar: Okay and you did say that there will be a short.
- Councillor Squire: 1.8 metres.
- Amony Omar: 8.8 metres?
- Councillor Squire: 1.8 metres I think was what they said wooden fence.
- Amony Omar: Oh, I'm sorry.
- Councillor Squire: Yep.
- Amony Omar: Wooden fence.
- Councillor Squire: Yep.
- Amony Omar: Okay. I'm writing all this down here. I have a gate, I don't know why there's a gate. I can actually literally open the gate and walk into the property. Will you be getting rid of the chain link fence?
- Councillor Squire: I'll ask that, okay? Applicant, are you going to, I assume you will be building the wood fence inside of the chain link fence. Perhaps I'm wrong.
- Scott Allen, MHBC: Mr. Chair, we can certainly investigate that. I just don't think that that specific detail has been evaluated yet but the most appropriate approach is what we will take.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. There will be another site plan meeting and these things will be ironed out but it's good you came today to mention them. Okay?
- Amony Omar: Okay. Thank you so much.
- Councillor Squire: You're very welcome. Have a nice evening.
- Amony Omar: You as well.
- Councillor Squire: Any other public? I'm sorry? Is someone speaking? No. Okay, any other participants? Okay, we'll go back to the Committee then. This was moved and seconded. Okay, who is on the line now?
- Hi, my name is Roberto Voivoda with my wife Moo Ching.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. I did not know you were going to speak but now that you are here it's our pleasure to hear you so go ahead.
- Robert Voivoda: Thank you very much. We are having issues trying to set everything up in order to do it.
- Councillor Squire: Yep, that's okay.
- Mr. Chair, it's Cathy Saunders, I believe these individuals are here for item 3.4, not 3.1.

- Councillor Squire: Oh. Okay.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: I believe they are here for 16 Wethered Street North.
- Councillor Squire: Okay.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: If they could confirm that.
- Robert Voivoda: Yes.
- Catharine Saunders: We are not on that item right now.
- Robert Voivoda: Okay. Sorry.
- Councillor Squire: That's okay. Okay, let's take one more final shot at this. Is there any; are there any other public presentations? Councillor Hopkins was there something you wanted to say when this is done or?
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes. Mr. Chair. Are we going to be closing the public participation meeting as well?
- Councillor Squire: Yes. Let's do that.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.2 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 1752-1754 Hamilton Road

- Councillor Squire: Staff presentation? Go ahead. Thank you very much. Just to change things a little bit we are going to have the applicant make their presentation and then I'll let the Committee make, ask technical questions of both the applicant and staff so that we're covering that off before we go to the public. Is there a presentation from the applicant?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, I do not have an agent for the applicant showing. I do have a member of the public in attendance.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Any technical questions then just of staff? Councillor Hopkins.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yeah. Thank you and through the Chair, to Mr. Mottram, thank you for the presentation and a few questions. I have about the, I just hope I have the right application here. Municipal services to the area, is it, it's suggested that a holding provision may be applied but I'd like to know a little bit more if the, if there are municipal services that are adequate for this area. My second question is around the open space, just wanting to know what is being done to buffer the open space to this development as well.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Larry Mottram, Senior Planner: Yes. Sure. The servicing is available, all storm water, sanitary sewer and municipal water is available along Hamilton Road. There is a storm water management facility that has been constructed by the City to service this development and the engineering drawings are currently in their second submission of review which includes a detailed design for all of the servicing for development here including the subject lands. The open space lands have also been considered as part of the planning for the draft plan of subdivision and it includes the buffering for the delineation of the development limit. The identification of the environmentally significant area and the buffer have all been included as part of the draft approval plan and as part of the zoning so that includes lands that are just a little bit further to the east and north of the subject site that include ravine lands and it also includes the Thames Valley pathway trail which will run along the edge of the open space and through this Draft Plan of Subdivision we're able to incorporate that pathway project.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Alright, we're going to hear from one member of the public? Okay.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Yes, Mr. Chair, Mr. Simm is here in attendance.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Mr. Simm. Are you there Mr. Simm?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Simm is on mute. We've asked him to unmute. Here he goes, he should be there now.
- Mr. Simm: Hello?
- Councillor Squire: Mr. Simm?

- Mr. Simm: Can you hear me there?
- Councillor Squire: I can hear you now. This is Phil Squire, I'm Chair of the Committee. You have five minutes to make your presentation starting now.
- Gary Simm: Thank you. My name is Gary Simm and my family owns the property beside 1752 Hamilton Road at 1764. My family has lived here for the last seventy years. 1752, our lot and the lot to the south, the original three lots, sold on this street were sold to veterans in World War II under the DLA sections *Land Act* which was formerly Westminster Township. 1752, as I said, was the first home on the street and we are opposed to its demolition and the creation of four lots. It should remain where it is, the streetscape does not really need to be altered. Many of the residents on this street feel the same way. I've outlined my comments further to Mr. Hillier, Ms. Pelosa and Mr. Lewis and some of the Councillors in a little less detail about my opposition to the applicants plan of design among other issues. I have spoken previously with other residents of the street, I would say most of them are adamantly opposed to altering the streetscape and, again, the creation of four lots. Many wanted to participate but they are either at work and kind of found this process difficult to navigate as well as did I myself although I do appreciate you guys taking the steps to do this. If I could say anything, it would be to take away here, I would like to see a vote of some sort among the neighbours and in conjunction with Council maybe put through post or at our local church here to have a further meeting about this site and what is going on on this street as far as development once the stay-at-home orders have lifted. Just in regards to my family's home at 1764 it is going to be impacted by vibration, it already has been across the street and what is going on everybody down here has had their homes shaking. I do realize that's, you know, part of what happens with infilling but we have a septic system, chimneys, outbuildings and ultimately this plan is going to reduce the value of our home, create further lack of privacy, issues with lights at night which are already happening across the road. Basically, if Council were to put this application through, we'd like to see a berm with trees, something like a spruce or juniper put from front to back just inside the applicant's property line to allow for further privacy as we have three acres and about a thousand foot deep property. It's basically being rendered useless which is more or less because of the creation of the subdivision at the back of our property, you know, you've got a thousand foot property that you've got no privacy now due to what they are going to build with roundabouts and so forth. We've kind of mentioned to the developer we do want to install a fence down the property line or just inside our property line but nobody on the street that I have spoken to thus far is happy about the plan. One thing I did want to note was is the City has lowered the road in front of our houses, kind of without notice back in 2018, 2017 and right beside the applicant's front driveway, our driveway, there's an island there that's been that way for, like I say, seventy years and the driveways are, the dimensions are not right and that is going to have to be corrected so I don't know how that will affect the applicant's plans but one of the comments that many neighbours are just a little upset about is, is that a lot of the trees in the front yard of 1752 have been taken out; mind you, that being said, a lot of the trees have been taken down at the rear of the property which got approval and further and other lands that they own on the street but the big bugaboo would be people are saying we're in a Tree Protection Zone and we're in this Environmentally Sensitive Area as anybody really in London like as Meadowlily, the amount of animals and wildlife that are back here it's tremendous really and so we are kind of just wondering, specifically with the trees at the front, why was the developer able to cut down these trees at the front when this plan, this file is Z-3914 has not been yet approved. That was kind of just baffling to us and I specifically.
- Councillor Squire: You have a minute remaining sir.
- Gary Simm: I'm just about done. I spoke to one of the developer's workers and they had just flat out told me that the developer had tried to get some of these trees

out earlier without permission, without permits and CTV has been doing a story about how, you know, we're not meeting the targets for trees so that's kind of baffling to us. Just in conclusion, I'm just about done, many people are pretty irate with what's gone on, you know, they work their butts off to be outside of a 30 x 50 lot and they've created lots here with mature trees and a large neighbourhood and, you know, now basically, two developers are carving up the neighbourhood and people have basically just said, I'm sorry, I'm just about done, the City doesn't really care about us, they'll do what they want, we're the east end and the neighbours on the street have had a meeting with the developers and the City in July of 2018 and have kind of said that a lot of our concerns have gone unaddressed and they are kind of left with what do I have to do, go to the media or an appeals board and our, like my family alone, like I've tried to.

- Councillor Squire: Okay. You did say, because you said you were about done I didn't interrupt you but your time is pretty much up. I'll give you ten seconds, okay?

- Gary Simm: Could I have, would it be okay if I had thirty seconds more? I'm just.

- Councillor Squire: Go ahead. Just as long as you stick to that sir.

- Gary Simm: Yes. Thanks sir. I've been trying to be respectful with the developer but we've had constant issues with the developer's sending their workers on our property the last three years, trespassing on our yard, verbally abusing my mother, members of the family, and due to the actions of this developer my mother was hospitalized, rendered unconscious a while back and it's just, we're left just shaking our head at this like how they're allowed to get away with what they get away with.

- Councillor Squire: Okay. That is your time sir.

- Gary Simm: Thank you very much.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you.

- Gary Simm: Thank you.

- Councillor Squire: Any other members of the public? Alright. We'll need a motion to close the public participation meeting.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Request to Remove Properties from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Any technical questions from the Committee and I should add that the LACH Report Item, sorry, what was the number, 4.3 we'll also deal with that at the same time, the LACH recommendation. I did find that actually on page 467, I'm not sure if it is on the Added Agenda but it's 467 of the main Agenda and the recommendation is received there. Any technical questions? Alright. Is somebody prepared to move the recommendation along with the LACH recommendation contained in this report as paragraph 4.3?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair we have some members of the public here for this item.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Let's go ahead, then.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: First is Ms. Valastro.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Ms. Valastro?
- AnnaMaria Valastro: Hi. I haven't read the LACH recommendations. I actually didn't see them here but I just wanted to speak to this matter because I feel like a lot of these houses are being removed because they are in the way. We know that the City wants to widen Wellington Road so they can put in bus lanes and when I look at these houses I admired actually a lot of these houses; they are working class houses. I recognize some of them are not, I don't know about every single one of them, there's no report, really, for me to read on each individual building but there are some buildings there that, for someone just looking at them on, they're, they're beautiful, there's examples of them on other parts of the city like the peaks, the gable, the peaked roof on some of these houses and the bungalows but very rarely are they examples of middle class structures that emulate ones that are more grand and I'm always dismayed when middle class or lower income houses are not given any historical or cultural value and, again, I don't know what LACH said but I do feel that these are being delisted en mass because they are in the way and I, again, this comes down to this idea that we have to widen a road to make room for transit when, in fact, we should just be narrowing traffic lanes down to one like so many other cities, they don't make them bigger, they make them smaller for cars and then they balance it out with, they make room for public transit not the other way around and I feel like this is being deregulated because they are in the way and as there is no report here, there's not much I can say other than that seems to be the outstanding motive here. I recognize there has been an assessment but a lot of that assessment is interpretive and as someone who is familiar with that stretch of road, I see a lot of history when I look at some of those houses anyways and I'm really disappointed that this, unless you can tell me they're not in the way, I'm really disappointed in the way the City approaches heritage unless they're grand. There is an example of history all through the ages and I will speak again when it comes to 126 Price Street but that's what I wanted to say. I just feel there isn't really much for the public to go on with this particular report, there's no, I don't see a LACH report myself and there's no report from the Heritage Planner.
- Councillor Squire: Ms. Valastro if I, there is a LACH report from the LACH meeting.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: I know but I, I haven't seen it. I'm sorry.
- Councillor Squire: Okay.



- AnnaMaria Valastro: I don't know. I guess it's on the first Agenda. I didn't look on the first Agenda.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. I'm just telling you there are, can I just finish please? There is a LACH Report and I believe the LACH concurred with the decision and again it's very brief just so you're aware of that.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: Oh, okay, I see. So they're in support. Okay. That's fine. That's all I wanted to say is that the overwhelming feeling I get is that these houses are in the way of something you want to do and what you want to do is just make a four lane highway basically bigger rather than smaller for cars and I drive a car and I can get down to one lane.
- Councillor Squire: Okay, we are getting, we do understand.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: That's fine. Okay.
- Councillor Squire: We do understand. You're getting to the end of your time if there is something quick you wanted to say?
- AnnaMaria Valastro: No. I'm done. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Next member of the public?
- Catharine Saunders: Mr. Chair, Goran Mamika.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Go ahead sir.
- Goran Mamika: I don't have a comment at this time.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Next member of the public.
- Catharine Saunders: Mr. Chair that is all we had for members of the public in attendance for this item.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Then we'll turn it over to the Committee. Did I close the public participation meeting prematurely? Then we're going to close the public participation meeting.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 16 Wethered Street North

- Councillor Squire: Staff presentation. I think the presentation is at page 209. Am I correct? The Added Agenda?
- I believe so, yes.
- Thank you. Just for staff, for Committee's reference if you are looking for it, that's where it is. Thank you very much. Go ahead. Thank you very much. As I indicated we will go to the applicant, let them present and then we'll do the technical questions. The applicant, go ahead please.
- Mr. Chair, it's Matt Campbell from Zelinka Priamo. Can you hear me?
- Councillor Squire: Yes I can.
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Wonderful. Thank you very much. Once again, Matt Campbell with Zelinka Priamo. I'm here with the applicant Phil Pattyn. Committee what you have in front of you here really boils down to interpretation of policies. Obviously you've heard the City's position and we don't agree with that position and we don't agree for two principle reasons. I believe the last point mentioned by Ms. Riley there was that this site doesn't have any special attributes. We contend that it does have special attributes and it's unique in its context on the site and when we're talking about the Near Campus Neighbourhood Policies there are two points that I would really like to bring up for Committee to consider: 1) is that the site is, in fact, unique; and 2) is that it is not located in the interior of the neighbourhood and those are the two key points that, that really, that, that Planning Committee should be mindful of when making a decision on this application this evening. When we look at 16 Wethered Street it is a very, very large lot. If you can look at the air photo there is a huge backyard area that is not being used. This is an excellent site for appropriate redevelopment and appropriate intensification so the reason why is this unique, not only because it's a large site, but also because of its location. It is literally a stone's throw away from Oxford Street. Those properties that front onto Oxford Street, those will be redeveloped under the policies of The London Plan for apartment buildings and mixed use buildings up to six storeys in height. We have received correspondence from the owner of 1160, that's the corner property, for a development proposal for a five storey apartment building. When we look at the context of that site versus 16 Wethered Street, again, it really emphasises the fact that perhaps there could be a transition of uses here going further North to the interior of the neighbourhood. When we're looking at those, those building heights it really doesn't make sense to leave this relatively large property with one unit on it. I hope Planning Committee was provided with the letters that were sent in just this morning. There were approximately seventeen letters from the public that were in support of this application. I'll, I'll leave it with Planning Committee to review those as well. The other points that I really wanted to make were the site, it is not in the interior of the neighbourhood. This is on the edge, the periphery of the neighbourhood, not the interior. If this property was fifteen, thirty, twenty-five, meters North I don't think we would be having this conversation today but it's right on the edge and it certainly warrants consideration especially when we have land use policies on literally the next property to the South that would permit a six storey building. We provide that, that this redevelopment proposal for eight two storey townhouse units is appropriate for this site. We think it makes a lot of sense and we would ask the Committee to provide a motion to recommend approval of the application which is contrary to the staff recommendation. I do have the developer, Phil Pattyn, available and we can

answer any questions and I will ask if Phil has any comments he would like to make to Planning Committee at this time.

- Councillor Squire: Go ahead. Okay. I don't think I have him here. He doesn't have to make comments.
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Okay.
- Councillor Squire: He can make them later.
- Phil Pattyn: Hello?
- Councillor Squire: Oh, sorry. Are you there? Mr. Pattyn? Okay. I'm going to move on to the Committee to ask technical questions. Technical questions only about, to the applicant or the staff, our staff, please. There are none so we'll move on to the public.
- Roberto Voivoda: Hello.
- Councillor Squire: Yes. Who is this?
- My name is Roberto Voivoda and Moo and we live at 1166 Afton: 1166.
- Councillor Squire: I'm sorry? What street did you say? Did you say Afton?
- Roberto Voivoda: No. Sorry, 1166 Bobby.
- Councillor Squire: Bobby.
- Roberto Voivoda: Correct. We're actually right beside the opposed, or the building that is being proposed.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Okay. Go ahead sir. You have up to five minutes.
- Roberto Voivoda: Thank you very much. We're opposing it for the 16 Wethered Street zoning amendment to be allowed for the eight storey building. For us, it took us a lot of effort and lots and lots of tries to actually try to get a house. The reason we liked this area in general was because it's a nice quieter family area. It's actually not right off of Oxford, it's in quite a ways so it's in a residential and it's a lot better for our kids which is two and four years old. We moved here on August the 1st so less than six months we have actually received a letter from the City about the planning application. We were very sad about the news for such a large building going in just because the whole area around it is nothing but just small houses. When we look at the aerial mapping, it actually isn't right off of Oxford, it's actually quite a ways in the center of all of these nice, small family homes, low density houses. We are a little concerned for many different reasons, for privacy, for the backyard, we have our kids out, for safety, with, we look at the proposed building, for the two storeys it looks, literally, right in to our backyard where the kids play, right into the kids building, like their bedrooms and we are concerned about the density of people, if it's going to be more students or not.
- Councillor Squire: Can I just – there, just to be clear someone else is talking and we're sort of getting two voices so it would be great – if someone else wants to speak they can speak afterwards if that is ok.
- Robert Voivoda: Okay. That's my wife.
- Councillor Squire: Oh. Okay.

- Robert Voivoda: We had lots of different things and we didn't know exactly everything that was going to be proposed for this where between the two lots there's just a very small chain link fencing as well. There's lots of different things that we're opposed to for this being built.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Go ahead.
- Hi Councillor. This is Moo speaking. I'm one of the partners of the neighbourhood of the property. Bobby Street. 1166.
- Councillor Squire: Okay.
- Moo Ching Chang: I am speaking to the meeting for 16 Wethered Street application for eight unit two storey townhouse development. I'm actually opposing it because it is for my family and our safety concerns and privacy and I hope that the proposal will not be able to go through. It's just that I know that it's not for, for the commercial or business perspective is they could probably, you know, make more money and be able to utilize the backyard for a single property but if it comes to a unique property I think that the backyard for that is actually not quite enough for the space plus the whole property is in the middle, in the center of all the low density residential so if you put in the eight unit townhouse and right across, right behind and viewing into our backyard. It just makes me and my kids will not be feeling safe or comfortable, be able to let them go outside and play and exercise for the approving. This is my concern for it.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Did you want to add anything else or is that fine?
- Moo Ching Chang: Yeah. I also will worry if my two kids that, two and four, we just move in here less than a year and we were thinking to raise them in here quietly and safe because we are just down the road to the Catholic school primary Blessed Sacrament and then we were thinking about the other Catholic schools St. John II and we were thinking to live here until they grow up so we were actually very sad and upset.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Thank you. Thanks to both of you very much. We appreciate your comments. Thank you.
- Moo and Roberto: Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you.
- Moo Ching Chang: My two kids, two and four and we move in here less than a year.
- Councillor Squire: I know. Yes, you told us that. I think we've got what you're saying. Is there – I thought you were done. Is there something else you wanted to add?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, another individual on the call was unmuted so they were – it was delayed. We have muted that individual.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Perfect then.
- Catharine Saunders: We do have one more.
- Councillor Squire: Perfect.
- Catharine Saunders: individual.

- Councillor Squire: Great. Thank you.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Judy Vatcher.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead.
- Judy Vatcher: Hi. I live at 22 Wethered Street with my husband Jim and he's here as well. We have a few concerns about the property. One of them is that we are right next door to that and our backyard is, their backyard is going to be facing our backyard so we're going to have eight units that are going to be looking onto our backyard and we're concerned about the noise. Once people get in there I'm, from my understanding it's only going to be about five or six meters from the start of the building to my property line so, of course, we're worried about people in there that these are their backyards or if it was their front yard, either one, we've got the noise from them. If they have dogs, let's just say that even half of them have dogs then there's barking dogs not just one that you have next door to you but eight or four or whatever it would be. We were told that there is going to be a fence between the property and some trees and that which is good. I don't know how high the fence is going to be, we want it high enough that people aren't just able to look over the fence and into our backyard. Things like air conditioning going on and off times eight, you know, it just seems like a lot of people in that spot. One of the things that was brought up was the fact that it's a huge lot and there's all kinds of space in behind but if you look at the aerial picture, all the backyards are like that in this neighbourhood. That's not unique and if this zoning goes through then how many other people are, you know, going to do something like that. The other concern I had was garbage. We don't know how that's going to be handled but I think that's the main part of it for me. Whatever happens we're willing to work with the people but if you are asking me do I want this or not, no. I guess that's all I have to say.
- Councillor Squire: Great. Did your husband want to add anything?
- I think Judy covered most of it, mostly concerns like we have been here as long-time residents and this is your country-like yard right here. I'm from the small town of Kincardine and my property has gone from that to like double to single and smaller, it's being dwarfed. The worst part is we're going to have traffic right out, they're going to turn in right there where we are, where this stands now and we don't want that and there's so many young kids along here now and the people speed, go flying by. We just want to see, make sure they're safe, we're safe and people aren't just partying and whatnot in the backyard all the time.
- Judy Vatcher: There's only room for one spot, I think, for somebody to park or maybe there is a garage there too but, you know, there's enough parking on our street as it is. Sometimes in the evening there's three or four cars in the front of our house and what's it going to be like when you've got eight more people in there and they've got friends over and stuff like that.
- Councillor Squire: Okay.
- Judy Vatcher: Alright.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much for participating. We appreciate that. Have a really nice evening.
- Judy Vatcher: Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Any other members of the public?

- Catharine Saunders: Mr. Chair I believe that is it. We were expecting a Christina but I have a Christine on the call and I believe Christine is here for another item so without the last name we're not totally sure but I think that's good for this item.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate that. We'll need a motion to close the public participation meeting.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.5 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Demolition Request for Garage on Heritage Listed Property – 325 Victoria Street

- Councillor Squire: Alright. Do we have a staff presentation? Thank you. Do we have that part of the report from the LACH Committee before us today? 4.5 so we'll also be moving approval of the recommendation from LACH of item 4.5. Thank you very much. Is the applicant here?
- Yes. This is Deishin Lee. I'm here with my husband Eric Van den Steen and we're here just to answer questions.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Thank you very much. Any technical questions from the Committee? Alright. Are there any other public participants? There being none I will ask for a motion to close the public participation meeting.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.6 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 135 Villagewalk Boulevard (SPA18-067)

- Councillor Squire: Staff presentation please. Thank you very much. Is the applicant here? Hello?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Allen is here on behalf of the applicant.
- Councillor Squire: Mr. Allen? Hello. Mr. Allen?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Allen you are unmuted. You should be able to speak.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. It doesn't appear that.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, Mr. Soufan is in attendance.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Mr. Soufan can speak hopefully.
- Scott Allen, MHBC: Mr. Chair, can you hear me now? Scott Allen, MHBC.
- Councillor Squire: Yes. I can hear you now.
- Scott Allen: My apologies. I don't know what happened there. MHBC acting on behalf of the applicant. With me today is Carlos Ramirez, actually, and he's able to respond to any specific questions relating to the project design. At this time we'd like to simply express our support for the findings of the Development Services report presented by Mr. Maitland. We also wanted to reiterate as he did that this proposal relates to the first phase of site development and is designed to comply with the applicable Official Plan, Area Plan and zone permissions and associated design guidelines. Applications for future phases will address development plans for the balance of the property, most importantly the Villagewalk Boulevard main street as discussed. We'd also like to thank staff for their support through this application and just to advise the Committee that the applicant intends to proceed with site development this summer. Thank you for your consideration and we'll gladly answer any questions the members may have.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Technical questions for staff or the applicant, please? There being none we'll close the public participation meeting. No one else I take it?



## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.7 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – Demolition Request for Heritage Listed Property – 126 Price Street

- Councillor Squire: Alright. Thank you. Thank you very much and just to point out this relates to Item 4.2 on the LACH Report which is the concurrence with this recommendation. We'll also be moving it and seconding it and approving it or not approving it with the staff recommendation. Is the applicant present?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Yes, Mr. Chair. Levy Leverton is in attendance.
- Councillor Squire: Good evening. Did you want to speak tonight or not? You don't have to.
- Levy Leverton: No. I don't have anything to say. I just appreciate your time.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. You'll want to stay tuned and see what we say. Any other members of the public?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Christine Fletcher or Scott is on the line.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Go ahead.
- Christine Scott: Hello.
- Councillor Squire: Hi.
- Christine Scott: Can you hear me?
- Councillor Squire: Yes, I can.
- Christine Scott: My name is Christine.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. You have five minutes. It's Christine. I'm sorry, you're last name?
- Christine Scott: Scott.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. Thank you very much.
- Christine Scott: Okay. I own a home at 97 Smith Street which is a listed heritage property. My other half of coming up to twenty-two years is at 145 Price Street which used to be an old funeral home. We had seen, we were very interested in 126 Price Street and buying it. It was where Bill and Cathy that were in there before, they sold it privately, everything went privately, there was never a sign on the property. Levy ended up purchasing it from a woman, a realtor and we did talk to him at that time to see about purchasing it because we wanted to keep it it's original way and it was where the amount of money that was asked of us to pay within two weeks of him owning the property and nothing really done. The house was gutted when he had purchased the house so when my other half at 145 Price Street, Bill, he had said about he received a letter and we feel that it should not be done. I did go around down Price Street to Holman Street. I did get twenty-seven signatures for a no on demolition. I believe the property like, the bricks being taken off, it was a beautiful cottage home and yes, I understand structure problems, but structure problems can be fixed. I feel, we feel, there was an out if it was going to be too much problem because we were interested with it as a heritage property. The tree also in front of 126 Price Street is also a heritage tree. It's original there, there's a, it used to be a

post office on Price Street, there was a doctor on Price Street. 145 Price Street was a funeral home so it's where it just a shame to take a cottage home, beautiful cottage home that was there and demolish it and change the landscape of that area. As I said, we also own a home on 97 Smith Street, it's a Queen Anne cottage home, it's beautiful and it's just a no vote for us and twenty-seven other people from Hamilton Road to Holman Street and if you could the amount of people I pretty well got everybody's signature except for two people that rented, one couldn't speak English and the other one worked for the City and he didn't want to respond. I had talked to the guy at 128 Price Street and he was the one who, because we were interested in what was going on, and he was the one who let me know about a woman realtor and everything just went very private so we were interested in purchasing that property to keep it as the heritage home that it is and the characteristics and we had even commented that we would go to ACE Wrecking, all the different places and try to get it back to its original state. We have to stick up for these heritage homes so I guess thank you for hearing me and I hope you do a "no" vote.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much for your time to speak to us. We appreciate it.
- Christine Scott: Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: Any other members of the public that wish to speak?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Yes. Ms. Valastro.
- Councillor Squire: Ms. Valastro? Ms. Valastro?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Ms. Valastro you are on mute. We have asked you to unmute.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: I'm just here to speak on this demolition request because I'm always very disappointed when small cottages that are representative of people that came to Canada, that lived along the river. The river was the life of a lot of these small working class people that came to Canada. It 's a wood structure, it's just a perfect representation of working class, new Canadians set up along the river and because they're not glamorous, they're tiny, it's wood, it's old growth forest, these should be considered valuable cultural structures because they say so much about who lived there and what these communities were like and a lot about the river and I'm really disappointed that they are not recommended for preservation just based on our history and, again, the same thing happened at Blackfriars, at 82 Blackfriars. That was the last standing house in that neighbourhood, it saw the flood, it survived the flood and it got demolished because there is nothing overwhelmingly special about that, that house except that it was rich with history, the same with this cottage and I wish Council would protect more of those intrinsic historical, cultural values and not just on the fact that it's wood, it's small. Those are worthy of protection so I hope you vote no as well.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Any other members of the public? Okay. There being none I will just need a motion to close the public participation meeting.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.8 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 1697 Highbury Avenue North

- Councillor Squire: Can I get a staff presentation, please? Thank you very much. Thank you. Is the applicant present?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Yes, Mr. Campbell is speaking on behalf of the applicant.
- Councillor Squire: Mr. Campbell?
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd: Good evening Mr. Chair. Can you hear me again?
- Councillor Squire: Yes, I can.
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Wonderful. Thank you very much to Ms. Debbert for the presentation. I don't have much to add other than the fact that we're very excited to be before Planning Committee with this application on behalf of.
- Councillor Squire: Now I can't hear you.
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Oh. Okay. Sorry about that. Am I back now?
- Councillor Squire: Yes, you're back.
- Matt Campbell, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Great. I was just saying we're very excited to be in front of Committee. We think this is one of these feel good projects that we're very excited to bring forward. There was the slight revision to the application as City staff mentioned but we're coming to the table hand in hand as we like to say. We think this is an excellent win for both Habitat for Humanity and for the community of London so I'm happy to answer any questions that the Committee may have. We also have a representative from Habitat for Humanity on the call as well and if there's any specific questions that are more in tune with their operations they can answer that question as well.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Technical questions only from the Committee? Councillor Cassidy is here also. I don't know if you have any technical questions. Nope. Alright. We'll move on to the rest of the public.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair, there's no members of the public in attendance with respect to this matter.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. I will just need a motion to close the public participation meeting.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.9 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 1634 – 1656 Hyde Park Road, 1480 North Routledge Park and Part of 1069 Gainsborough Road

- Councillor Squire: Is there a staff presentation for this matter?
- Barb Debbert, Senior Planner: Thank you Mr. Chair. There is a slide show.
- Councillor Squire: We love our slide shows but go ahead. Thank you. Is the applicant present?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair.
- Ben McCauley, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Can you hear me?
- Councillor Squire: I can.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. McCauley is here on behalf of the applicant,
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Mr. McCauley go ahead.
- Ben McCauley, Zelinka Priamo Ltd.: Thank you. Again, good evening Mr. Chair and Committee Members. My name is Ben McCauley from Zelinka Priamo Ltd. and I am the agent representing the applicant, HLH Investment. I have just a brief comment. Initially there was an application on this entire block between North Routledge Park and Gainsborough Road which was ultimately split into two separate applications. A Zoning By-law Amendment application proceeded to Committee and Council early in 2020 as staff alluded to for the south side of this block for an identical proposal and construction has begun on that portion of the site; however, the north portion of the site, which is under consideration tonight, was handled separately primarily to address heritage comments and concerns. We are happy to share that we have come to an agreement with planning and heritage staff on how to best address the designated heritage structure on the site and we look forward to proceeding with the subsequent site plan approval application to facilitate the remainder of the construction of the full block that will truly transform this intersection. Thank you for your time and I'm happy to answer any questions.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Any technical questions for either staff or the applicant? Councillor Hopkins.
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you Mr. Chair. Through you to staff, I think on the parking, just wondering, are we looking at 114 on-site parking and I just want to confirm the parking situation.
- Councillor Squire: Go ahead staff.
- Barb Debbert, Senior Planner: Through you Mr. Chair, the exact number of parking spaces escapes me but the parking rates that we are looking at are one space per unit for the residential component as well as for the commercial component a standard rate of one space for every twenty square meters of gross floor area for commercial space. The philosophy that was applied to the development to the south as well as this one is that because of the form of development we can expect some sharing of space to occur because we have obviously more intense requirements for residential parking in the evenings and overnight and then more intense requirements for commercial purposes during the day.

- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. The question is, the surface parking is more shared with the commercial and then there's underground for residential. I just want to.
- Councillor Squire: Is that a question you are asking through me?
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes, I just want to make sure I'm reading the recommendation that way.
- Councillor Squire: Okay. Staff, can you just confirm that?
- Barb Debbert, Senior Planner: Yes, that would be correct.
- Councillor Squire: There you go. Any other technical questions only? Okay. Other public participation, there are no other public comments from what I understand so I need a motion to close the public participation meeting.

# Planning and Environment Committee

## Report

9th Meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee  
May 31, 2021

PRESENT: Councillors P. Squire (Chair), S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, Mayor E. Holder

ALSO PRESENT: H. Lysynski, M. Ribera and C. Saunders

Remote Attendance: Deputy Mayor J. Morgan and Councillors M. Cassidy, J. Helmer, E. Pelozo and M. van Holst; G. Barrett, J. Dann, B. Debbert, L. Dent, M. Feldberg, J. Gardiner, K. Gonyou, M. Greguol, P. Kavcic, P. Kokkoros, G. Kotsifas, L. Maitland, C. Maton, H. McNeely, L. Mottram, B. Page, M. Pease, D. Popadic, A. Riley, M. Schulthess, B. Somers, M. Tomazincic and P. Yeoman

The meeting is called to order at 4:00 PM, with Councillor P. Squire in the Chair, Councillor S. Lewis present and all other Members participating by remote attendance

### 1. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest

That it BE NOTED that no pecuniary interests were disclosed.

### 2. Consent

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That Items 2.1 to 2.6, inclusive, BE APPROVED.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

#### 2.1 234 Edgevalley Road - Removal of Holding Provisions - (H-9342)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Ironstone, relating to the property located at 234 Edgevalley Road, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on June 15, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM a Holding Residential R5/Residential R6 (h\*R5-7/R6-5) Zone TO a Residential R5/Residential R6 (R5-7/R6-5) Zone to remove the "h" holding provision. (2021-D09)

**Motion Passed**

2.2 704 and 706 Boler Road - Boler Heights Subdivision - Special Provisions - (39T-15503)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to entering into a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Southside Construction Management Limited, for the subdivision of land over Concession 1, Part Lot 44, situated on the east side of Boler Road, north of Southdale Road West, municipally known as 704 and 706 Boler Road:

- a) the Special Provisions, to be contained in a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London and Southside Construction Management Limited, for the Boler Heights Subdivision (39T-15503) appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix "A", BE APPROVED;
- b) the Applicant BE ADVISED that Development Finance has summarized the claims and revenues appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix "B"; and,
- c) the Mayor and the City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute this Agreement, any amending agreements and all documents required to fulfill its conditions. (2021-D12)

**Motion Passed**

2.3 995 Fanshawe Park Road West - Creekview Subdivision Phase 4 - Special Provisions - (39T-05512-4)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to entering into a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London, Landea North Developments Inc. and Landea Developments Inc., for the subdivision of land over Part Lot 22, Concession 5 (Township of London), City of London, County of Middlesex, situated on the north side of Bridgehaven Drive, south of Sunningdale Road West, west of Applerock Avenue, municipally known as 1196 Sunningdale Road West:

- a) the Special Provisions, to be contained in a Subdivision Agreement between The Corporation of the City of London, Landea North Developments Inc. and Landea Developments Inc., for the Creekview Subdivision Phase 4 (39T-05512\_4) appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix "A", BE APPROVED;
- b) the Applicant BE ADVISED that Development Finance has summarized the claims and revenues appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix "B";
- c) the financing for this project BE APPROVED as set out in the Source of Financing Report appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix "C"; and,

d) the Mayor and the City Clerk BE AUTHORIZED to execute this Agreement, any amending agreements and all documents required to fulfill its conditions. (2021-D12)

**Motion Passed**

2.4 1600 Twilite Boulevard - (H-9345)

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Foxwood Developments (London) Inc, relating to the property located at 1600 Twilite Boulevard, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on June 15th, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM a Holding Residential R1 (h\*h-100\*R1-4) and (h\*h-100\*R1-13) Zones TO a Residential R1 (R1-4) and (R1-13)) Zones to remove the "h and h-100" holding provisions. (2021-D09)

**Motion Passed**

2.5 Building Division Monthly Report for March 2021

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That the Building Division Monthly Report for March, 2021 BE RECEIVED for information. (2021-A23)

**Motion Passed**

2.6 4th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That the 4th Report of the Environmental and Ecological Planning Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on May 20, 2021 BE RECEIVED for information.

**Motion Passed**

**3. Scheduled Items**

3.1 349 Southdale Road East - (Z-9308 / 39CD-20501)

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: E. Holder

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Incon Developments Ltd., relating to the lands located at 349 Southdale Road East:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on June 15, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM a Residential R3 (R3-3) Zone TO a Residential R6 (R6-5)



Zone to permit cluster housing in the form of townhouse dwelling units with a maximum density of 34 units per hectare; and,

b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the following issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Draft Plan of Vacant Land Condominium relating to the property located at 349 Southdale Road East:

- i) safety;
- ii) privacy;
- iii) tree ownership on the property line; and,
- iv) possible removal of the chain link fence;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding this matter. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

### 3.2 1752 – 1754 Hamilton Road

Moved by: S. Hillier

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Connor Wilks c/o Thames Village Joint Venture Group, relating to the lands located at 1752 – 1754 Hamilton Road, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix 'A' BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on June 15, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject lands FROM a Residential R1 (R1-14) Zone TO a Holding Residential R1 (h•h-100•R1-3) Zone;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding this matter;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended zoning by-law amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement;
- the recommended zoning conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Neighbourhoods Place Type, Our Strategy, City Building and Design, Our Tools, and all other applicable London Plan policies;
- the recommended zoning conforms to the policies of the (1989) Official Plan, including but not limited to the Multi-Family, Medium Density Residential designation; and,
- the zoning will permit single detached dwellings which are considered appropriate and compatible with existing and future land uses in the surrounding area, and consistent with the zoning that was applied to the adjacent draft-approved plan of subdivision. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

### 3.3 Request to Remove Properties from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

That, on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the following properties BE REMOVED from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources:

- a) 1033-1037 Dundas Street;
- b) 1 Kennon Place ;
- c) 19 Raywood Avenue;
- d) 32 Wellington Road;
- e) 34 Wellington Road;
- f) 90 Wellington Road;
- g) 98 Wellington Road;
- h) 118 Wellington Road;
- i) 120 Wellington Road;

- j) 122 Wellington Road;
- k) 126 Wellington Road;
- l) 134 Wellington Road;
- m) 136 Wellington Road;
- n) 138 Wellington Road;
- o) 140 Wellington Road;
- p) 142 Wellington Road;
- q) 166 Wellington Road;
- r) 220 Wellington Road;
- s) 247 Wellington Road ;
- t) 249 Wellington Road;
- u) 251 Wellington Road ;
- v) 253-255 Wellington Road;
- w) 261 Wellington Road;
- x) 263 Wellington Road;
- y) 265 Wellington Road;
- z) 267 Wellington Road;
- aa) 269 Wellington Road;
- bb) 271 Wellington Road;
- cc) 273 Wellington Road;
- dd) 275 Wellington Road;
- ee) 285 Wellington Road;
- ff) 287 Wellington Road;
- gg) 289 Wellington Road;
- hh) 297 Wellington Road;
- ii) 301 Wellington Road;
- jj) 327 Wellington Road;
- kk) 331 Wellington Road;
- ll) 333 Wellington Road;
- mm) 72 Wellington Street; and,
- nn) 44 Wharncliffe Road North;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding this matter. (2021-R01)

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (6): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, S. Hillier, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (6 to 0)**

3.4 16 Wethered Street North - (Z-9309)

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by 2445727 Ontario Inc. (Phil Pattyn), relating to the property located at 16 Wethered Street:

a) the application by 2445727 Ontario Inc. (Phil Pattyn), relating to the property located at 16 Wethered Street BE REFERRED back to the Civic Administration for further discussion with the applicant and to report back at a future Planning and Environment Committee meeting; and,

b) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to review the proposal within the context of the Near Campus Neighbourhood Policies, as they relate to residential intensification, focusing on lots that front onto neighbourhood streets, but are immediately adjacent to rapid transit place types or urban corridor place types;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the staff presentation with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding this matter. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

3.5 Demolition Request for Garage on Heritage Listed Property - 325 Victoria Street

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: A. Hopkins

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the request to demolish the garage on the heritage designated property at 325 Victoria Street BE PERMITTED, and the Chief Building Official BE ADVISED of Municipal Council's intention in this matter;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received a communication dated May 24, 2021, from C. Egerton, 315 Victoria Street, with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding this matter. (2021-P10D/R01)

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: A. Hopkins  
Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Moved by: A. Hopkins  
Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

3.6 135 Villagewalk Boulevard – (SPA18-067)

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: P. Squire

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by 2560334 Ontario Limited, relating to the property located at 135 Villagewalk Boulevard:

a) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that no issues were raised at the public meeting with respect to the application for Site Plan Approval to permit the construction of a 2 commercial pads in the southeast corner of the subject lands and associated accesses; and,

b) the Approval Authority BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council supports issuing the Site Plan Application;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications with respect to this matter:

- a communication dated May 26, 2021, from S. Lebert, by e-mail; and,
- a communication dated May 26, 2021, from A. Mustard-Thompson, by e-mail;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding this matter. (2021-D11)

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lehman  
Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

3.7 Demolition Request for Heritage Listed Property - 126 Price Street

Moved by: A. Hopkins  
Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendations of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, with respect to the demolition request for the existing dwelling on the heritage listed property at 126 Price Street, the following actions be taken:

- a) the Chief Building Official BE ADVISED that Municipal Council consents to the demolition of the dwelling on the property; and,
- b) the property at 126 Price Street BE REMOVED from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications with respect to this matter:

- a communication dated May 22, 2021, from W. Rohrer and C. Scott; and,
- a petition signed by approximately 24 individuals is on file in the City Clerk's Office;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding this matter. (2021-P10D/R01)

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis  
Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lehman  
Seconded by: S. Lewis

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

3.8 1697 Highbury Avenue North - (Z-9302)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, based on the application by Habitat for Humanity Heartland Ontario Inc., relating to the property located at 1697 Highbury Avenue North, the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on June 15, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Residential R5/Residential R6 (R5-2/R6-4) Zone and an Open Space (OS5) Zone TO a Residential R5 Special Provision (R5-7(\_)) Zone and an Open Space (OS5) Zone;

it being noted that the following site plan matters were raised during the application review process:

- i) orientation of the easterly stacked townhouse building to Highbury Avenue North;
- ii) visual access for the southerly end units to the open space area and the Thames River interface be enhanced by providing increased number of windows and/or balconies;
- iii) naturalization of the Open Space lands on the site; and,
- iv) the potential conveyance of all or part of the Open Space lands to the City;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the staff presentation with respect to this matter;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding this matter;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which encourages the regeneration of settlement areas and land use patterns within settlement areas that provide for a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment. The PPS directs municipalities to permit all forms of housing required to meet the needs of all residents, present and future;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Key Directions;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Low Density Residential designation and Environmental Policies; and,
- the recommended amendment facilitates the development of a site within the Built-Area Boundary and the Primary Transit Area with an appropriate form of infill development. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**



Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

3.9 1634 – 1656 Hyde Park Road, 1480 North Routledge Park and Part of 1069 Gainsborough Road – (Z-9301)

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by 1630 HP Inc., relating to the property located at 1634 – 1656 Hyde Park Road, 1480 North Routledge Park and Part of 1069 Gainsborough Road:

a) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on June 15, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan), to change the zoning of the subject property FROM a Business District Commercial (BDC) Zone and a Business District Commercial Special Provision (BDC(39)) Zone TO a Business District Commercial Special Provision Bonus (BDC\*B-\_) Zone; the Bonus Zone shall be implemented through one or more agreements to facilitate the development of a mixed-use apartment building, with a maximum height of 8-storeys or 29 metres and a maximum density of 169 units per hectare, in general conformity with the Site Plan, Renderings and Elevations appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Schedule "1" to the amending by-law, and provides for the following:

1) Exceptional Building Design

- i) providing an 'L'-shaped mixed-use building that is generally in keeping with the vision of the current Official Plan as well as The London Plan by providing for continuous street walls along the Hyde Park Road and North Routledge Park frontages;
- ii) providing a 7-storey massing along Hyde Park Road that includes a significant step-back above the second storey and 8-storey massing along North Routledge Park;
- iii) providing for appropriate scale/ rhythm/ materials/ fenestration;
- iv) incorporating all parking in the rear yard and underground, away from the adjacent street frontages;
- v) providing ground floor commercial space with transparent glazing and principal entrances facing the Hyde Park Road frontage creating an active edge;
- vi) providing ground floor residential units with individual entrances

and patio spaces along the North Routledge Park frontage;

vii) providing a rooftop patio;

viii) providing a parking lot layout that accommodates appropriate driveway alignments across North Routledge Park; and,

ix) relocating the existing heritage structure and providing a glass link between the heritage structure and the new building along the North Routledge Park frontage, and a recessed courtyard immediately south of the heritage structure;

## 2) Provision of Affordable Housing

- a total of five (5) one-bedroom units will be provided for affordable housing. Subject to the concurrence of the City, some or all of these five (5) one-bedroom units may be allocated from the adjacent development owned and/or managed by the Proponent, noting the bonus zone requirement and encumbrance would remain specific to the Subject Lands;

- rents not exceeding 80% of the Average Market Rent (AMR) for the London Census Metropolitan Area as determined by the CMHC at the time of building occupancy;

- the duration of affordability set at 50 years from the point of initial occupancy;

- the proponent enter into a Tenant Placement Agreement (TPA) with the City of London to align the affordable units with priority populations; and,

- these conditions to be secured through an agreement registered on title with associated compliance requirements and remedies;

## 3) Relocation, conservation, and adaptive re-use of the existing heritage designated structure at 1656 Hyde Park Road:

- the owner shall enter into a Heritage Easement Agreement with the City of London;

b) pursuant to Section 34(17) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13*, as determined by the Municipal Council, no further notice BE GIVEN in respect of the proposed by-law as the recommended zoning implements the site concept submitted with the application;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with this matter, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding this matter;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves this application for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), 2020, which encourages the regeneration of settlement areas and land use patterns within settlement areas that provide for a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment. The PPS directs municipalities to permit all forms of housing required to meet the needs of all residents, present and future;

- the recommended amendment conforms to in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Key Directions and the Main Street Place Type policies;

- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Main Street Commercial Corridor designation;

- the subject lands represent an appropriate location for mixed-use residential intensification, within the Hyde Park Village Core and the recommended amendment would permit development at an intensity that is appropriate for the site and the surrounding neighbourhood;

- the recommended amendment secures units for affordable housing through the bonus zone; and,
- the recommended amendment facilitates the development of a site within the Built-Area Boundary and the Primary Transit Area with an appropriate form of infill development. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: A. Hopkins

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

3.10 Public Participation Meeting - Not to be heard before 5:30 PM – 435-451 Ridout Street North - (OZ-9157)

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, the following actions be taken with respect to the application by Farhi Holdings Corporation, relating to the property located at 435-451 Ridout Street North:

- a) consistent with Policy 19.1.1. of the Official Plan for the City of London (1989), the subject lands, representing a portion of 435-451 Ridout Street North BE INTERPRETED to be located within the Downtown Area designation;
- b) consistent with Policy 43\_1 of The London Plan, the subject lands, representing a portion of 435-451 Ridout Street North, BE INTERPRETED to be located within the Downtown Place Type;
- c) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix "A" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on June 15, 2021 to amend The London Plan by ADDING a new policy the Specific Policies for the Downtown Place Type and by ADDING the subject lands to Map 7 – Specific Policies Areas – of The London Plan;

it being noted that The London Plan amendments will come into full force and effect concurrently with Map 7 of the London Plan;

d) the proposed by-law appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Appendix "B" BE INTRODUCED at the Municipal Council meeting to be held on June 15, 2021 to amend Zoning By-law No. Z.-1, (in conformity with the Official Plan (2016) as amended in part c) above), to change the zoning of a portion of the subject property FROM a Heritage/Regional Facility (HER/RF) Zone and a Downtown Area Special Provision (DA2(3)\*D350) Zone TO a Holding Downtown Area Special Provision Bonus (h-3\*h-55\*h-\_\*DA2(3)\*D350\*B-\_) Zone;

the Bonus Zone shall be implemented through one or more agreements to facilitate a high quality mixed-use office/residential apartment building, with a maximum height of 40-storeys (125 metres), and a maximum density of 500 units per hectare, in general conformity with the Site Plan and Elevations appended to the staff report dated May 31, 2021 as Schedule "1" to the amending by-law in return for the following facilities, services and matters:

1) Exceptional Building Design

- i) retention in situ of the heritage buildings along the Ridout Street frontage;
- ii) materials on the podium of the building that are in-keeping with the surrounding heritage buildings;
- iii) a slender point tower design;
- iv) the tower portion of the building located to the south of the podium to increase the spatial separation between the tower and the Eldon House property;
- v) interesting architectural design features on the tower that will enhance the downtown skyline and break up the building mass;
- vi) terraces overlooking Harris Park and providing opportunity for activating these terraces with the proposed adjacent office/commercial uses; and,
- vii) connections between Ridout Street North and Queens Avenue to Harris Park that provide new entrance opportunities to further connect the Downtown with the Park.

2) Provision of four (4) levels of underground parking, of which a minimum of 100 parking spaces will be publicly accessible

3) Provision of Affordable Housing

The provision of affordable housing shall consist of:

- a minimum of twelve (12) residential units or five percent (5%) of the total residential unit count (rounded to the nearest unit), whichever is greater;
- the mix of affordable one- and two-bedroom units will be based on the same proportion of one- and two-bedroom units as within the final approved plan. Subject to availability and with the concurrence of the City, some or all of these units may be secured through existing vacancies in developments owned and/or managed by the proponent or associated corporate entity;
- rents not exceeding 80% of the Average Market Rent (AMR) for the London Census Metropolitan Area as determined by the CMHC at the time of building occupancy;
- the duration of affordability shall be set at 50 years from the point of initial occupancy; and,
- the proponent shall enter into a Tenant Placement Agreement (TPA) with the City of London to align the affordable units with priority populations;

4) Conservation, retention, and adaptive re-use of the existing heritage designated buildings at 435, 441, and 451 Ridout Street North

- the owner shall enter into a Heritage Easement Agreement with the City of London;

5) Construction of a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certified building

it being noted that the following site plan matters were raised during the public participation process:

i) design the parking and drop-off areas between the building and the adjacent streets (Ridout Street North and Queens Avenue) as a shared plaza space, using pavers or patterned concrete to:

- I) tie into the design of the terraces
- II) reduce the amount of asphalt
- III) provide a welcoming entrance to the development
- IV) provide for a stronger connection between the stairs leading to Harris Park and the City sidewalks along the streets;

ii) design the westerly stairway as a more naturalized landscape solution to soften the experience and avoid blank brick walls. This stairwell should provide for a grand entrance feature between the development and the Park;

iii) final location and design of all vehicular accesses on-site, including service access;

iv) final location, design, and landscaping of publicly accessible spaces, including terraces, staircases, and walkways;

v) the final building design is to incorporate bird-friendly design features;

vi) the applicant is to work with the City of London with regards to compensation restoration to create a wetland and other natural features (ie forest), either on-site or within Harris Park; and,

vii) the final building design is to include a fully enclosed mechanical penthouse, clad in materials complementary to the building, to screen rooftop mechanical equipment and contribute positively to the skyline.

f) pursuant to Section 34(17) of the *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13*, as determined by the Municipal Council, no further notice BE GIVEN in respect of the proposed by-law as the changes in building height and setback to the residential component of the building are minor in nature and the illustrations circulated in the Notice of Application and Notice of Public Meeting accurately depict the development as proposed;

it being pointed out that the Planning and Environment Committee reviewed and received the following communications with respect to this matter:

- a communication dated May 20, 2021, from C. Naismith, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 20, 2021, from D. McKillop, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 20, 2021, from R. Lacy, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 20, 2021, from K. Baker, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 20, 2021, from C. Ryan, by e-mail;
- communications dated May 20, 2021, from E. Rath, by e-mail;
- the staff presentation;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from C. Littlejohn, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from K. Kydd, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from U. Troughton, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from B. McQuaid, by e-mail;

- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from G. Hodder, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from M. Conklin, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from M. Young, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from M.A. Colihan, 191 Sherwood Avenue;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from B. Reilly and R. Shroyer, 574 Victoria Street;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from S. Skaith, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from S. Andrejicka, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 26, 2021, from M. Temme, 66 Palmer Street;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from M.L. Collins, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 26, 2021, from H. Guizzetti, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 26, 2021, from M. Rooks, by e-mail;
- a communication from M. Whalley, 39-250 North Centre Road;
- communications dated May 26, 2021, from A.M. Valastro, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from B. Spratley, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 25, 2021, from S. Shroyer, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 25, 2021, from C. Woolner, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 25, 2021, from K. Elgie, Chair, Board of Directors, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario;
- a communication dated May 25, 2021, from K. Peckham, Wide Eye Television Inc.;
- a communication dated May 25, 2021, from J. Grainger, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from J. Devereux, 926 Colborne Street;
- a communication dated May 21, 2021, from P. and J. Wombwell, 174 Guildford Crescent;
- a communication dated May 21, 2021, from M. Romhanyi, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from S. Saunders, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from J.C. Garnett, University Librarian Emeritus, Western University;
- a communication dated May 26, 2021, from S. Bentley, 34 Mayfair Drive;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from L. Brown, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from B. and S. Morrison, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from A. Martin, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from D. Rogers, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from S. Agranove, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from J. Manness, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from N. Bol, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from A. Warren, Director of Operations, The Wedding Ring;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from J. Farquhar, 383 St. George Street;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from J. Hunten, 253 Huron Street;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from J. and D. Surry, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from B. and H. Luckman, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from G. Nicodemo, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from K. and G. Patton, 20-50 Northumberland Road;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from S. Lunau, 1096 Kingston Avenue;
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from J. Spencer, by e-mail;
- a communication dated May 25, 2021, from K. McKeating, President, Architectural Conservancy of Ontario - London Region;
- a communication dated May 28, 2021, from A. Little, by e-mail;

- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from D. Oates, by e-mail; and,
- a communication dated May 27, 2021, from C. Mellamphy, by e-mail;

it being pointed out that at the public participation meeting associated with these matters, the individuals indicated on the attached public participation meeting record made oral submissions regarding these matters;

it being further noted that the Municipal Council approves these applications for the following reasons:

- the recommended amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, which encourages land use patterns within settlement areas that provide for a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment, as well as • enhancing the vitality and viability of downtowns and mainstreets;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of The London Plan, including but not limited to the Downtown Place Type and Key Directions;
- the recommended amendment conforms to the in-force policies of the 1989 Official Plan, including but not limited to the Downtown Area designation;
- the recommended amendment conforms to Our Move Forward: London's Downtown Plan, by providing for a landmark development on an underutilized site;
- the recommended amendment secures units for affordable housing through the bonus zone; and,
- the recommended amendment facilitates the development of an underutilized site at an important location in the Built Area Boundary and Primary Transit Area. (2021-D09)

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and S. Hillier

Nays: (1): A. Hopkins

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (4 to 1)**

Additional Votes:

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Lehman

Motion to open the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (4): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, and S. Hillier

Absent: (2): A. Hopkins, and E. Holder

**Motion Passed (4 to 0)**

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

Motion to close the public participation meeting.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

#### 4. Items for Direction

##### 4.1 5th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Lehman

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 5th Report of the London Advisory Committee on Heritage from its meeting held on May 12, 2021:

a) M. Corby, Senior Planner, BE ADVISED of the following comments from the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) with respect to the Notice of Application for Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments and the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), dated January 2021, from Zelinka Priamo Ltd., with respect to the property located at 850 Highbury Avenue North, previously received by the LACH:

i) sufficient information has not been received as part of the application in order to appropriately assess the impacts of the proposed applications on the significant heritage resources on this property; it being noted that:

A) the HIA should be prepared by a qualified heritage professional;

B) the HIA should include an assessment of impacts to identified heritage resources of the proposed development, among other content as identified in Info Sheet #5 provided by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries; it being noted that the HIA provided with the application does not speak to the impacts of the proposed development or proposed policy changes on the cultural heritage resources on the site; and,

C) the LACH is supportive of maintaining the overall land use concept identified within the proposal, which is generally consistent with that in the London Psychiatric Hospital Secondary Plan (LPHSP); it being noted that this includes the proposed low density residential in the core area with concentration of higher densities along adjacent arterial roadways (the 'bowl' concept) and the revisions to the road and pedestrian networks, which appear to support the protection and enhancement of the cultural heritage resources;

- the LACH emphasizes the need to consider the built heritage resources as landmarks within the cultural heritage landscape, and that the assessment of impacts must address the cultural heritage landscape including views and vistas as described through the appropriate governing documents;

- the LACH acknowledges the differences or 'inconsistencies' between elements of the Heritage Conservation Easement, designating by-law L.S.P.-3321-208, and the LPHSP as identified within the HIA, but notes that these documents each have different forms and functions, and do not necessarily conflict (save for mapping discrepancies); it being noted that where these differences or 'inconsistencies' are identified, the more detailed description and assessment should apply;

- the LACH does not support many of the proposed changes to heritage policies within the LPHSP which serve to reduce protection of the heritage resources and introduce greater uncertainty; it being noted that sufficient rationale or justification for these revisions to heritage policies have not been provided within the Final Proposal Report or HIA (examples include but are not limited to:

- o LPHSP 20.4.1.4 – "Retain as much of the identified cultural and heritage resources of the area as possible feasible";

- o LPHSP 20.4.1.5.II.a) – "provide for ....and mixed-use buildings where possible";



- o LPHSP 20.4.2.2 – “Development proposed through planning applications... will need not only to consider the significant heritage buildings, but also the unique cultural heritage landscape where possible”;
- o PHSP 20.4.3.5.2.III. d) “Built form adjacent to the Treed Allee within the Heritage Area shall should be encouraged to oriented towards the Allee in applicable locations”; and,
- o LPHSP 20.4.4.10 - “shall” to “should”);

- the LACH requests clarification from City of London Heritage and Planning staff on the next steps with respect to this development application, including how the impacts to built heritage resources and the cultural heritage landscape will be assessed and addressed as the planning and design phases progress (for example, can/will an HIA be required for subsequent zoning bylaw amendment applications and/or site plan applications); it being noted that the LACH respectfully requests that these assessments be provided to LACH for review and comment;
- the LACH respectfully requests to be consulted early on any proposed changes to the designating bylaw or heritage conservation easement and would welcome a delegation from the proponent to present on heritage matters on the property; and,
- the LACH requests information from City Staff and/or the proponent on the current physical conditions of the heritage structures on the site;

b) on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* seeking retroactive approval for the removal and replacement of the windows on the heritage designated property located at 40 and 42 Askin Street, By-law No. L.S.P.-2740-36 and Wortley Village-Old South Heritage Conservation District, BE REFUSED; it being noted that this Heritage Alteration Permit application is seeking retroactive approval for window replacements that were previously considered and refused by Municipal Council;

it being noted that the London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH) encourages the applicant to work with the Heritage Planner to address the concerns raised by the LACH at the meeting;

it being further noted that a verbal delegation from P. Scott, with respect to this matter, was received;

c) on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the demolition request for the existing dwelling on the heritage listed property located at 126 Price Street:

- i) the Chief Building Official BE ADVISED that the Municipal Council consents to the demolition of the dwelling on the property; and,
- ii) the property at 126 Price Street BE REMOVED from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources;

d) on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the following properties BE REMOVED from the Register of Cultural Heritage Resources:

- 1033-1037 Dundas Street;
- 1 Kennon Place;
- 19 Raywood Avenue;
- 32 Wellington Road;
- 34 Wellington Road;
- 90 Wellington Road;
- 98 Wellington Road;
- 118 Wellington Road;

- 120 Wellington Road;
- 122 Wellington Road;
- 126 Wellington Road;
- 134 Wellington Road;
- 136 Wellington Road;
- 138 Wellington Road;
- 140 Wellington Road;
- 142 Wellington Road;
- 166 Wellington Road;
- 220 Wellington Road;
- 247 Wellington Road;
- 249 Wellington Road;
- 251 Wellington Road;
- 253-255 Wellington Road;
- 261 Wellington Road;
- 263 Wellington Road;
- 265 Wellington Road;
- 267 Wellington Road;
- 269 Wellington Road;
- 271 Wellington Road;
- 273 Wellington Road;
- 275 Wellington Road;
- 285 Wellington Road;
- 287 Wellington Road;
- 289 Wellington Road;
- 297 Wellington Road;
- 301 Wellington Road;
- 327 Wellington Road;
- 331 Wellington Road;
- 333 Wellington Road;
- 72 Wellington Street; and,
- 44 Wharncliffe Road North;

e) on the recommendation of the Managing Director, City Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the application under Section 33 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* seeking consent for alterations to the heritage designated property located at 426 St James Street BE GIVEN, subject to the following terms and conditions:

- the new railing be 24" in height above the porch floor to maintain the proportions of the porch;
- wood be used as the material for the alterations;
- all exposed wood be painted; and,
- the Heritage Alteration Permit be displayed in a location visible from the street until the work is completed;

f) on the recommendation of the Director, Development Services, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the request to demolish the garage on the heritage designated property located at 325 Victoria Street BE PERMITTED, and the Chief Building Official BE ADVISED of Municipal Council's intention in this matter; it being noted that the communication, dated May 10, 2021, from B. Jones and K. Mckeating, as appended to the Added Agenda, and the verbal delegations from D. Lee, E. Van den Steen, B. Jones and K. McKeating, with respect to this matter, were received;

g) on the recommendation of the Director, City Planning and City Planner, with the advice of the Heritage Planner, the following actions be taken with respect to the potential designation of Labatt Memorial Park as a National Historic Site of Canada:

- i) the above noted initiative BE ENDORSED; and,
- ii) the Civic Administration BE DIRECTED to undertake the application process with respect to this matter;

h) clauses 1.1, 2.1 to 2.4, inclusive, 3.1, 3.2, 4.7 and 4.8 BE RECEIVED for information.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

4.2 4th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment

Moved by: A. Hopkins

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That, the following actions be taken with respect to the 4th Report of the Advisory Committee on the Environment, from its meeting held on May 5, 2021:

a) the following actions be taken with respect to Greener Homes London:

i) the presentation, as appended to the Added Agenda, from S. Franke, London Environmental Network, and a verbal delegation from S. Franke, with respect to the Greener Homes London program, BE RECEIVED;

ii) a representative from London Hydro BE INVITED to a future meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Environment to speak with respect to:

- future infrastructure improvements to assist with climate change reductions;
- alternative energy sources for providing power to the city;
- fuel forecasting to support the Climate Energy Action Plan and net zero targets; and,
- demand side management strategy and on-bill financing for home energy retrofitting;

b) the following actions be taken with respect to the Notice of Planning Application, dated March 31, 2021, from C. Parker, Senior Planner, with respect to Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments related to Encouraging the Growing of Food in Urban Areas – City-Wide:

i) the Civic Administration BE ADVISED that the Advisory Committee on the Environment (ACE) supports the amendments made to date and the amendment that is currently under review; it being noted that the ACE has been involved with the urban agriculture process and development; and,

ii) the above-noted Notice BE RECEIVED;

c) Jack Gibbons of the Ontario Clean Air Alliance BE INVITED to a future meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Environment to speak to the current campaign of the Clean Air Alliance; and

d) clauses 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2, inclusive, and 4.1 BE RECEIVED for information.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

## **5. Deferred Matters/Additional Business**

### **5.1 Deferred Matters List**

Moved by: S. Lehman

Seconded by: S. Lewis

That the Deputy City Manager, Planning and Economic Development BE DIRECTED to update the Deferred Matters List to remove any items that have been addressed by the Civic Administration.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

Absent: (1): E. Holder

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

### **5.2 (ADDED) 4th Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee**

Moved by: S. Lewis

Seconded by: S. Hillier

That the following actions be taken with respect to the 4th Report of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee, from its meeting held on May 26, 2021:

a) the Educational Initiatives and Outreach Sub-Committee recommendations, appended to the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee (TFAC) Agenda, BE FORWARDED to the Civic Administration for consideration and to report back at a future meeting of the TFAC; it being noted that the TFAC reviewed and received the "May 2021: TFAC Educational Initiatives and Outreach Subcommittee: A Few Suggestions and Comments" on the City of London Website;

b) the following actions be taken with respect to creating ecosystems in London:

i) a Working Group BE ESTABLISHED consisting of J. Kogelheide, A. Hames and A. Morrison, to review the creation of ecosystems in the City; and,

ii) the Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to attend a future Trees and Forests Advisory Committee meeting to provide an update on the initiatives currently being undertaken;

it being noted that the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee reviewed and received a communication from J. Kogelheide with respect to this matter;

c) the following actions be taken with respect to the Advisory Committee Review - Interim Report VI:

i) A. Cantell BE REQUESTED to prepare recommendations on the Advisory Committee Review - Interim Report VI and to report back at the

next meeting of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee meeting; and,  
ii) the Chair of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee (TFAC) BE REQUESTED to attend a future Planning and Environment Committee meeting to provide an overview of the TFAC recommendations with respect to these matters;

it being noted that the TFAC reviewed and received staff report dated May 17, 2021, with respect to these matters;

d) the following actions be taken with respect to the Urban Forestry Communications Strategy:

i) Civic Administration BE REQUESTED to attend the next meeting of the Trees and Forests Advisory Committee to provide an update on the Urban Forestry Communications Strategy;

ii) P. Nichoson BE INCLUDED on the existing Working Group; it being noted that the Working Group consists of A. Cantell and M. Demand; and,

iii) the Urban Forestry Communications Strategy BE INCLUDED on the 2021 Trees and Forests Advisory Committee Work Plan.

e) clauses 1.1, 2.1 and 2.2, inclusive, 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4, BE RECEIVED for information.

Yeas: (5): P. Squire, S. Lewis, S. Lehman, A. Hopkins, and S. Hillier

**Motion Passed (5 to 0)**

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:40 PM.

## PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING COMMENTS

### 3.10 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – 435-451 Ridout Street North (OZ-9157)

- Councillor Squire: Alright. Presentation. I assume there is.

Catherine Maton: Senior Planner: There is Mr. Chair. This is Catherine Maton from Planning and Development. I do have slides prepared as part of my presentation.

- Councillor Squire: They're on page, just so we are all on the same page.
- Catherine Maton: I believe it's on page 504.
- Councillor Squire: Right. Just for the Committee we are starting with the presentation that's at page 504 of the Agenda including Added. Go ahead. Thank you very much. Is the applicant present or a representative?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr. Chair it is my understanding that Mr. Tillman will speak on behalf of the applicant.
- Councillor Squire: Alright.
- Tom Tillman: Mr. Chair, is my audio coming through?
- Councillor Squire: It is coming through and welcome to the Committee, we're looking forward to your presentation and you have five minutes starting now.
- Tom Tillman: Thank you very much. Well, I will try, I will stay within the five minutes because I know you will make me stay within the five minutes.
- Councillor Squire: I will.
- Tom Tillman: I have a timer going here. Well first let me just say thank you to City staff for the report they put together supporting the application and this development. The only correction I had to Catherine's remarks were we, we began in 2012 on this project with Farhi Holdings. A discussion with our office and Farhi about the potential of the site after the City had presented some diagrams in a planning document they put together about investment in the downtown and what was possible. In 2013, we did meet with planning staff and the Upper Thames to talk about what were the so called showstoppers of where did we need to, to go first and, at that time, we put together a what we called option one. We met with again staff and Upper Thames and decided that that meeting with Upper Thames and going through their Board was going to be an important first step. In 2015 a second option was explored with City staff again, Upper Thames and at that time I went to UTRCA Board and that was rejected because of the amount of space that we were taking up within the floodplain. A third option was developed in 2017 that repositioned the building outside of the floodplain and that was not getting support from City planning staff. By 2018 we had a fourth option that seemed to meet with City staff as well as UTRCA staff and as mentioned in May of 2018 that option was presented to Upper Thames and the Board approved that particular option and that's the one you're seeing here with some adjustments made to it. In July of 2018 we had a justification report submitted and met with City staff to put it for a site plan consultation and by December of 2019 option four had been revised a little bit in terms of positioning of the tower as it related to comments back from the Urban Design Review Panel and it was then presented to Eldon House, the building was, the tower was shifted south to be as far from Eldon House as possible, about seventy-six meters or so from Eldon

House. In March of 2020, we did confirm back to UTRCA that the project was still alive and that it was moving through the rezoning process and in November of 2020 we responded to comments received from both LACH and Eldon House and then in April of 2021 we responded to development services heritage with the concerns that they raised and certainly we recognize that the heritage aspects and importance of the site are critical and we have made the commitment that we will be putting together all of the reports that Catherine has identified in the staff report. This is the kind of work that is not unfamiliar to our firm in terms of what is required having done work recently at University College, Western, St Joseph's hospital and the Heritage Chapel that's there as well as work at 192-194 Dundas Street and so we take that very seriously, you know, the important point for us was that we are preserving all of the existing three buildings that make up the Ridout Street complex and, in fact, will be restoring them along with, along with integrating them into the proposal so this creates a very sort of unique proposal. I'm not sure that there's anything.

- Councillor Squire: You have one minute left.
- Tom Tillman: I see that. Maybe the closest thing that that comes to a project like this was the Delta Armouries project but I think this one's different but I think what makes it so unique is it is a London made solution. This is not something that's repeatable anywhere else. I think that's what's happening with the land going back to Harris Park, and the opportunities of how this particular site is going to link downtown to the Thames River and vice versa it is going to be something that's quite dramatic and it will become a very sort of public space if you will. It's a dynamic mixed-use development that I think will strengthen the downtown. It builds on the investments that have been made downtown as well as the fact that I think it will promote better development through design excellence. Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: 4 minutes and 59 seconds. Very good. Technical questions for staff or the applicant? These are technical questions only. Councillor Hopkins.
- Councillor Hopkins: Yes. Thank you. I do have a question through you to the applicant regarding the application that went to the Upper Thames Conservation Board, the fourth, the fourth review. I just would like to know a little bit more about that.
- Tom Tillman: Sure. It was the third review was where it was passed. The first review, the building had been positioned so that it was not abutting any of the existing heritage properties and at that time, although we did have support from the Upper Thames staff, it was turned down at the Board. There were concerns raised at that time about how would we waterproof the building. There hadn't been any discussion at that time about deeding land or, or giving land back to the City to complete the south end of Harris Park. When we went back the second time, we had moved the building to the south end and it didn't seem to satisfy the, the issue again related to how are we dealing with flood protection as well as displacement of water from putting a building in the flood plain so at the, in the third offering to Upper Thames we were able to satisfy them the flood protection measures would be in place, that there would not be property damage in that regard and that we had, through the transfer of land to the City, we could do a cut and fill that dealt with the displacement of water of the parking structure sitting in the flood plain and they were looking for a balance of a net zero gain of flood water being pushed into the rest of the city, if you will.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Councillor?
- Councillor Hopkins: Thank you. If I just might add, I, I just wanted clarification on the Hearings Board approval, just to make sure I understand what the applicant is saying here.

- Tom Tillman: Oh, sorry, that we have approval for the development as presented with the package that City staff have provided you and they have Section 28 if I've got my right policy in place that there's certain matters that still have to be satisfied through the S.P.A. process.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Anything further in technical questions? There being none we will move on to the public.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Mr Chair Alex Farrell is here.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. I'm sorry, Barrell or Farrell? Barrell? Mr. Barrell?
- Alex Farrell: Sorry Mr. Chair, it's Alex Farrell.
- Councillor Squire: Farrell. I'm sorry about that. I heard something different.
- Alex Farrell: No problem.
- Councillor Squire: You have five minutes starting now.
- Alex Farrell: Thank you very much for your time today Mr Chair, Mayor Holder and Council members. My name is Alex Farell and I live across the street from Bankers Row in London. I escaped downtown Toronto in 2018 to take care of my mother who has Alzheimer's and to improve my quality of life. I've lived and travelled in most major Canadian cities and in many other parts of the world. I can honestly say that London is truly unique because of its history and its connection to nature; however, as a resident I am very concerned about this project. We are still living in a pandemic and people are still really hurting and struggling. Many business owners, small and large, have stepped up to combat and the pandemic and help the city in this time of need. As one of the city's large property owners how has Mr. Farhi helped the city in its time of need? Has he used temporary shelters for homeless people or essential workers with the vacant land properties that he owns? This project does not address the homelessness of London and the exodus of tenants from its urban center over the last twenty years. It mainly benefits Mr. Farhi to have the tallest tower in London all the way west to.
- Councillor Squire: Can I just, can I just stop you there if you don't mind.
- Alex Farrell: Sure.
- Councillor Squire: This, this is not an attack on a particular person or other things they may do. This is a planning application with regard to this particular development so I've given you a little bit of leeway but continuing personal attacks of any nature whoever it is, is not something that we're going to do here.
- Alex Farrell: Okay. No thank you for letting me know. Okay. Can I continue?
- Councillor Squire: Yep. Go ahead.
- Alex Farrell: Okay. Okay. While putting tremendous strain on the city's limited resources and infrastructure to reiterate other voices this project is a slippery slope and will set the precedent to open up the floodgates and there will be no turning back. Mr. Farhi has stated that this project will be his legacy. Londoners will then be welcome to Farhi tower from all angles. Is this really what Londoners want to be its most recognizable monument? It will take a considerable amount of time and effort on his part. Is he biting off more than he can chew? As a professional I am very concerned about this project. As well as a former corporate banker for large financial institutions I've analyzed and managed billions of loans involving commercial real



estate, infrastructure, structured securities and film and television production over my twenty year career. I've also managed relationships with municipalities, universities, school boards and hospitals. Based on extensive research my main concern with Mr. Farhi is his experience, his development experience, to complete a hundred million dollar project of this size. I would like to know what projects he has actually developed over the last twenty years, start to finish, that are even close to a hundred million dollars. Farhi is the interface. Being new to London Farhi is the interface for the City of London. You can see this through many buildings and signs he has throughout the city itself. He does hold many valuable heritage properties, we all know. This reminds me of the railroads hundred years ago and, most recently, Amazon. The City is taking major risks by transforming one of its fundamental heritage by-laws to accommodate one person. We are in a new era of higher inflation and possibly higher rising interest rates around the corner so time is of the essence for Mr. Farhi. An inexperienced developer could handcuff the City for eight years and will leave it with little to no bargaining power. Moreover, construction for a complex project of this size will likely be four to six years due to unforeseen circumstances like broken water main, structural deficiencies, protests and traffic jams. The City's also taking a major financing risk here, will Farhi step up for cost overruns to complete the project if things don't go as planned? What assurances the city have other than his work? Lenders, lenders take first charge on all assets and are first in line to get paid.

- Councillor Squire: You have one minute remaining.
- Alex Farrell: Thank you. What freed up, unencumbered assets does Mr. Farhi have that have not already been leveraged with debt? For a project of this nature, specially for a new developer without a proven track record most major lenders would require that the developer put in fifty percent equity as part of the financing plan. In conclusion, yes, London needs to build up housing in its core for everyone; yes, London needs property tax revenue from these projects but also London also needs the right projects for the city at the right time and to maintain the city for its residents. Its resources could be better spent on projects with developers that are benefiting the needs of the community not one single wealthy individual. Companies that employ and generate cash flow will change London, not companies that buy and hold assets and sell and trade heritage properties as a tax and financing mechanism for its overall business operations. This is fundamentally a tale of two cities - the City of London and the City of Farhi. The question.
- Councillor Squire: That's. Your. Your time is up, sir. Your time is up.
- Alex Farrell: Thank you.
- Councillor Squire: I'm sorry. Your time is up. Thank you very much for coming today. Who is next?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Marvin Simner.
- Councillor Squire: Mr. Simner? Mr. Simner?
- Marvin Simner: Sorry, I just turned the microphone on.
- Councillor Squire: Alright. You have five minutes sir. Go ahead.
- Marvin Simner: I was absent during the beginning part of the discussion here but I just wanted to share with you one thing - I'm talking on behalf of the London-Middlesex Historical Society. Our concern here has to do with the fact that Harris Park is listed as a designated Part V Downtown Conservation Heritage District as is the case with Victoria Park. This designation was adopted by the Municipal Council

in 2012 and fell under the Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* of 2013 which means that Harris Park is considered to be as central to London's history as is much of the heritage site as much of the heritage site as Victoria Park; therefore, we believe that Harris Park deserves the same degree of consideration as has been granted to Victoria Park although today both parks are used for a variety of purposes that benefit London's citizens throughout much of the year. City Council recently drafted recommendations to limit the height of all future buildings to be erected adjacent to Victoria Park in order to maintain the ambiance of this park. In keeping with these recommendations we believe that similar thought needs to be given by the Council to the height of the proposed residential tower which could also negatively impact the ambiance of Harris Park. We do not wish to discourage the corporation from constructing a tower on the site any means that can be enacted to reduce the height of this tower by ten to fifteen storeys would be very much appreciated. Thank you for your time.

- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Next speaker?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Kelley McKeating.
- Councillor Squire: Ms. McKeating.
- Kelley McKeating: I trust you can hear me?
- Councillor Squire: I can hear you. Go ahead whenever you are ready.
- Kelley McKeating: Thank you and I know I'm on the clock. Hello. My name is Kelly McKeating and I'm speaking on behalf of ACO London. What we're asking you today is for the City to follow its own rules. The staff recommendation in front of you is to interpret the 1989 Official Plan and The London Plan in a way that differs from how they're written in order to justify approval of the requested Official Plan and Zoning Amendments. We're asking you not to do that but to respect and uphold the spirit and intent of those Plans giving serious consideration to paragraph 802.5 of The London Plan which provides for the Zoning By-law to include regulations to ensure that the intensity of development is appropriate for individual sites. We believe that the current zoning for the property - no building taller than the current buildings should be given considerable weight. This is a National Historic Site and arguably the most important historic streetscape in London. By the 1960's Bankers Row, London's first financial district, in the 1840's had become decrepit and run down. The plan was to demolish the block, partly to make way for a widening of Queens Ave and partly to get rid of an eyesore. Concerned members of the University Women's Club saw things differently and took steps to prove the buildings were important. Under the leadership of President Jake Moore, Labatt Brewery purchased and restored the three buildings and built a modern four storey addition to the rear and down the hill, remaining sensitive to the historic streetscape as they adapted the property to house their head office. From the citizen activism to save the Ridout Street complex ACO London was born. From that restoration the principle of adaptive reuse of historic buildings was introduced to London. Since 1970 the Ridout Street complex has been in continuous use by organizations large and small and the historic streetscape has been retained until now. The PEC should consider paragraph 803.6 of The London Plan that recognizes the primacy of *Ontario Heritage Act* HCD and national historic site protections. The London Plan requires continuity and harmony with adjacent uses that are of architectural or historical significance. The sheer size of this contemplated development makes harmony impossible. We have no quibbles with the design or height of the proposed tower. Our concern is with its location - a forty storey building on the site so close to 451 Ridout that they would actually share a wall fails to meet the requirements of the downtown HCD Plan. To remind you, new and renovated buildings must ensure the conservation of character defining elements of the buildings it neighbours, be physically and visually compatible with the historic

place, respect the significant design features and horizontal rhythm of adjacent buildings and be designed to be sympathetic to the district heritage attributes. You should also seriously consider the 2015 OMB ruling set an important precedent for Ontario. It ruled that a thirty-two storey building could not be constructed adjacent to a designated property. The OMB determined that respectful separation distance was critical to conserving the heritage attributes of the neighboring designated property given the reasons for designation and the character defining features of the Ridout Street complex and Eldon House we expect that Eldon, that Eldon, LPAT or the courts might take a similar view here. Our members are also concerned about the impact this project would have on Harris Park, Eldon House and on the city's river focus. To develop.

- Councillor Squire: You have about one minute remaining.
- Kelley McKeating: Okay. To encourage public access to and use of the historic Forks of the Thames, a vote for these amendments today means you're undoing decades of broad based efforts to retain the Forks as a centerpiece for Londoners when other locations for increased density exist. We should also be concerned with the foreseeable issues that future Councils will have to deal with if this application proceeds, puts a large building on land that may well be in the flood plain in the future. There's no underground parking being proposed. The four levels of inground indoor parking would be all the above ground where the existing rear addition currently stands. You must turn down this application based on all of the safeguards enshrined in the Official Plan and Zoning By-law and HCD Plan. Based on the demonstrated desire of the public is expressed in the numerous letters you've received and based on the premise that this building should be built in a different location and we thank you for considering these points.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Next speaker?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Maggie Whalley.
- Councillor Squire: Hello Ms. Whalley.
- Maggie Whalley: Hello. Can you hear me?
- Councillor Squire: I can. You can go ahead as soon as you wish.
- Maggie Whalley: Thank you very much. I'm Maggie Whalley, North Centre Road and I have, I feel many objections to this proposal. I have so many I don't know where to start but I'll try to bring it down to a few points. It's already been pointed out to you that on historical grounds this site is basically the centerpiece of London's historical heart. The Heritage Impact Statement that I read for this proposal was completely inadequate in, in recording this and represents basically ignoring or disregarding the importance of this site. We know and we've been told tonight there at least two designations on this site and it is a National Historic Site. All of these documents speak of any new developments as having to respect character and they cite streetscapes and views and viewscapes as being as significant as the structures themselves. This development would diminish and trivialize these buildings reducing them to an unimportant footnote, I think. As well as distorting and obstructing views. Banker's Row can be seen from a distance and is highly visible and has a completeness all of its own. Talking about context now, this is a set, a part of an extremely important historical scene, harking back to the very beginnings of our city. Can't get more important than that. This striked tower would be out of place, incongruous and rather ridiculous on this site. The wall of glass and metal and plastic would loom over Eldon House garden casting it into shade and destroying the special sense of place of that locale. This large building would cut off views of the river and also help to destroy any connectiveness with the river for London which so many

people have wished for and planned for, for so long. To get into the site as we know it right on the flood plain they had to go forty storeys because they had such a small foot print and that is totally unacceptable. I hope people have seen the photos that I've been seeing recently of the many floodwaters that have inundated this site and as far as I know, no one else is allowed to build on the flood plain. From a public and a community perspective don't forget that it's not just us history buffs or heritage activists who have an interest in this. Every, every comment that I've seen on social media in the last few weeks has been in opposition to this development and that's a very unusual statistic. I think, I'm sure you are aware, that very rarely happens and this is also true of everyone that I've spoken to. The word "ridiculous" was often used. This is our city, our view, our river. From a design point of view, I, I wonder why we run after density at all costs. This forty storey tower would become the highest in London. Why in this place? It looms over and dwarfs heritage buildings, it blocks views. I'm sorry but black and white stripes do not mitigate any of this intrusiveness. It's, I think, ill-conceived, incongruous and too tall, far too close to heritage buildings. Density, yes, I'm totally in favor of that but don't abandon all other principles in that desire. Good planning, suitability of sites and even design and aesthetics.

- Councillor Squire: One minute left.
- Maggie Whalley. Okay. I'm almost done and don't let a development like this harm our history, our history which should be a source of pride to a mature city. Thank you very much.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Next speaker?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Susan Bentley.
- Councillor Squire: Ms. Bentley. Ms. Bentley?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Ms. Bentley we've asked you to unmute if you could unmute your audio please.
- Susan Bentley: Hello?
- Councillor Squire: Yes. We now are hearing you and you can start anytime you wish.
- Susan Bentley: I'm sorry I may be a heritage enthusiast but I'm also a dinosaur, especially when it comes to technology. I've, I've got a written presentation but I, I think I want to just forget it and say in the interest of brevity that I just would like to echo and repeat what Ms. McKeating and Ms. Whalley said. I think the letter that the ACO sent you was superb and extremely detailed but I just want to add a few things. It is my fervent hope this rezoning application is denied and that the current height and setback allowances be maintained by Planning Committee. Were the worst case scenario to happen and Council does agree to this application I would also hope that a very stringent type of design guideline be attached to any consent. The height needs to be significantly lower, for example, and the building's overall mass decreased. Members of the LACH should be part of the guidelines change so the heritage attributes of the Ridout buildings and Eldon House are taken into account and respected in the use of materials. On the overall design, the current design and we know that this can be subject to change doesn't really reflect the surrounding context. With all due respect to Mr. Tillman, he said it was dramatic and I know he's very proud of it and it is certainly extremely dramatic. Just not quite sure, as others have said, that it's in the right place. The downtown HCD Plan states that the City should influence the renovation or construction of modern era buildings so that it is done with regards to the District and complementary to the character and

streetscape. I would dearly love to see Mr. Farhi develop the Wright Lithography building into condos and the Elsie Perrin Williams Memorial Library on Queens Avenue undergo its projected transformation into the underpinnings of a high rise development when there are opportunities for intensification throughout the downtown. Do not destroy historic views and natural landscape. Why is development not directed to them? Please listen to the many voices from Londoners who are stating their objections and deny this application. Unlike Macbeth, I do not believe that he will be cursed who states hold enough and I'm afraid I have a question. I only recently became aware of this application to build anything on this site thanks to the ACO and it seems that the proposal has already moved quite far along in the approvals process. My question is if these exceptions to the Zoning By-law are not allowed will the building be constructed anyway? Can a Committee Member or staff person inform us please?

- Councillor Squire: I will make sure that happens.
- Susan Bentley: Thank you so much. Thank you for your attention and thank you for allowing us to speak.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Next speaker.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Nancy Tausky.
- Councillor Squire: Ms. Tausky?
- Nancy Tausky: Hello. Am I unmuted?
- Councillor Squire: Nope, you're, we can hear you.
- Nancy Tausky: Okay. That's good. My comments, to echo some that have already been made, and I will try to, therefore, be very brief. I'm looking at things from a slightly different point of view. Thinking that this rezoning application is in fact the major. It, in fact, involves a major decision to be made with this site and, given that, it seems to me that there should be a lot more information that one usually finds in a site plan proposal, for example, Heritage Planners report talking about the historical importance of the buildings here and secondly, some substantial mention of the relationship between the river and these sites. This has been touched on by other people but I think a little elaboration is appropriate here. Governor Simcoe seized on this site for his new town on maps even before arriving in Canada because of the convergence of the river and the need for river transportation. This was his new London and his new Thames for his new Britain and his wife chose the site where Eldon House was eventually built as the site for her new home. Just one moment. I have to hang up. Bye. I'm sorry about that. Increasingly from the late 19th century on this site has been one for public enjoyment with its baseball diamond, boathouses, sulfur springs, picnic grounds, horse races, trails and increasingly festivals of various sorts and from the time of those first. I'm so sorry. From the time of those first forms of entertainment when we were having, when people were having the first horse races below the courthouse, people have been able to look up at these early buildings and be aware of the relationship between the river and the entertainment and London's origins. The third thing that's missing here is the well thought out report from LACH. I don't understand why Council hasn't been able to look at those comments when making their consideration about this, when making their decision about this proposal and finally, or not finally, I'm sorry, there should have been more, I think, on the effect that this will have on Eldon House and one's experience of the Eldon House grounds and the views from Eldon House grounds which were so important in its original siting. I don't understand why some consideration hasn't been given to the rationale for the previous zoning that we're now proposing to get rid of. It was attempting to unify this idea of heritage with the

idea of the river and I think that's a very important concept in the uses that have been made of the site and finally, I'm wondering why heritage considerations weren't an important, or why heritage.

- Councillor Squire: One minute. One minute remaining.
- Nancy Tausky: I'm wondering why people representing heritage considerations weren't involved in those original considerations back around 2012. This has been going on all this time and still it seems now that Council is being asked to make a decision on the rezoning for this massive property without really hearing a complete account of the other side of the picture. I don't think this is fair to Council, I don't think it's fair to the citizens of London and I agree with Maggie Whalley in thinking that intensification has an important place in London but that doesn't make it in all places. To misquote the author's idea about love conquering all, intensification should not.
- Councillor Squire: You have now, you have now hit five minutes. Please wrap up.
- Nancy Tausky: Yep. I'm done.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you very much. Next speaker?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: AnnaMaria Valastro.
- Councillor Squire: Ms. Valastro.
- AnnaMaria Valastro: I am here to read a letter from my neighbor who couldn't be here tonight. Dear Councillors and Mayor Holder, I was both saddened and horrified to learn that Mr. Farhi is attempting to build a 40-storey building along the Thames River. The building will radically impact the look and feel of the entire neighbourhood from all directions, affect the wildlife, change the peacefulness of a walk along the river, as well as impact concerts and other events in Harris Park. It will ruin London for generations to come. I am not opposed to big buildings, but it is imperative the impact of a building be measured against the harm to those who live in, and regularly use the area, as well as how well the building fits with its surroundings. I am currently a victim of what I consider an unnecessary large building on Richmond Street near Dufferin. Since I moved to John Street over a year ago, the view from my kitchen has radically changed from sky, trees and a few rooftops to a monolithic apartment building. I also see the building every time I walk down Richmond Street. It is jolting to the senses as it does not fit the historic neighbourhood at all. The same will be true of Mr. Farhi's proposed building as it will dwarf everything around it. I lived in the Blackfriars neighbourhood for 28 years and like many Londoners regularly walked along the river, crossed over the Dundas Street Bridge on route to the market and the rest of downtown. Sadly, I can easily imagine how horrible it will be to take that same walk and have a mammoth 40-storey building blocking the view, and destroying the ambience of the historic neighbourhood. It is truly a heartless move to approve this proposal. As well, Mr. Farhi and other builders in London know it is likely the approval of one 40-storey building on the river will set the precedent for more of the same in the future. Please stop the carnage while you can. This is by Jill Jacobson at 189 John Street, London, and I just want to add one quick note, the birds from the river, it can't, the building can't be bird friendly from the river side because the birds need to, need space to get the height they need to clear the building. I just want to make that note because it was raised by the Planner but you can't say things like that unless you actually, you can't say you're making a building bird friendly unless you understand where it is and how the birds take flight so I know a little bit about that so I just wanted to tell you that and that's, that's everything. Thank you again.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Next speaker?
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Patricia Morley Forster.

- Councillor Squire: Ms. Morley Forster. Ms. Morley Forster?
- Patricia Morley Forster: Good evening. Can you hear me?
- Councillor Squire: I can hear you now and you can start any time you like. You have five minutes.
- Patricia Morley Forster: Okay. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chair and Councillors. The other speakers have spoken very eloquently and thoughtfully about the potential negative impact of this very, very high tower. I just wanted to give a slightly personal view. My husband and I, through the pandemic, and also with friends have visited Harris Park, visited the waterfront much more than in the past and we have really been struck by the beauty of this area. We now understand that the Back to the River projects are trying to promote this green space and take advantage of the water front and I just think that this is a very retrograde step in that it would reduce access from the downtown to the waterfront rather than, as Mr Tillmann suggested, would link the down, link the downtown to the waterfront. It would be the exact opposite. We are not opposed to densification of the core and we are considering moving downtown but certainly not into this size of building. When I think of heritage, when I think of tourist draws and draws to locals, you think of the Stratford waterfront, the Goderich, St. Thomas, all of those places have used heritage to their advantage to make the streetscape pedestrian friendly and draw people down there to relax and this tower does the exact opposite both, of both. I will say destroying heritage but it may possibly ultimately damage both Eldon House and the Labatt's buildings, we just don't know with the foundation of a forty storey building. That is a concern but the visual streetscape will be destroyed and the green spaces will be also destroyed in ways that we don't even understand. The previous speaker mentioned about the bird pathways and the flood plain is a concern to myself and my husband. That's all I have to say. I know that the ACO wrote a very detailed report and I don't think all of the questions that were raised in that have been addressed tonight. We only heard of this on Saturday through The London Free Press article and I assume that many, many Londoners have also just heard of this, really, in the last twenty four hours. Thank you Mr. Chair.
- Councillor Squire: Thank you. Next speaker.
- Catharine Saunders, City Clerk: Susan Bradman.
- Susan Bradman: Yes, can you hear me?
- Councillor Squire: Yes I can and whenever you want to start you have five minutes.
- Susan Bradman: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you for letting me speak today and thank you to all the compelling speakers that have gone before me. When I read Saturday's story in The Free Press about Mr Farhi's proposal for his property near the Forks, I was really shocked. I, I posted the information on Facebook, spoke to family and friends and then I canvassed my neighborhood. I live in Oakridge. I got the same reaction, most people hadn't even heard of Farhi's proposal to erect a skyscraper at the Forks of the Thames right in the center of London's small but highly valued historical area. They were angry and saddened that this might happen without proper public debate or information sessions in the middle of a covid lockdown. My question to the Councillors is do you really feel due diligence has been given to inform the residents of London about this extremely important decision that has the potential to shake the entire downtown core immeasurably? Mr. Farhi, as you know, owns a large number of buildings in the downtown core, many of which are sitting empty and have been for some time so he has many locations to choose from to build his flagship skyscraper: the old free press building sitting empty would sustain a forty foot storey high skyscraper without presenting many of the foreseeable concerns that may also rise up with this current location choice if construction were allowed and some of the concerns that I received from my neighbors were the flood

plain, we were all kind of under the impression that the parking would have to be above ground because this was on the flood plain, the traffic flow through the Forks area which is already slow during non Covid rush hours and that can really, you can sit there for quite a while when you're heading down to Wharncliffe . Would be further hampered during and after construction with people pulling in for parking into this unit. A forty story skyscraper would block the sunlight falling on the Eldon House and its gardens and change the peaceful surrounding of this block immeasurably. London has managed to save three of the five historical buildings and Bankers Row but what guarantees, if any, can Mr. Farhi and his company provide that those buildings will remain intact and not be structurally damaged? There's been a fire in one of those buildings already, on September 24, 2018 and security, I walked around those buildings the other day with a friend, security definitely seems to be very limited. As a matter of fact there's a lot of homeless people living at the base of it. What environmental impact studies have been done in relation to the effect of construction and usage in the area outside the Planning Department? In conclusion I know Londoners care about this city and I remember over two thousand people who circled the Talbot Street block to protest the demolition of the Talbot Street Inn. That demolition started at 7:30 in the morning on a Sunday morning while most lenders were sleeping. That was a gut punch. Please don't be so blindsided again. Please postpone this vote until after the lockdown and after Londoners have been fully informed on this crucial decision to the downtown. To allow this project to go forward during the lockdown and the pandemic is unconscionable. Most Londoners have been restricted to their homes and their neighborhoods and if you drove down Dundas Street today from the west to the east you would see a core that is presently being used essentially by non-taxpayers. Is this an appropriate time to vote on this proposal? Please take time to inform the people of London. Thank you.

- Councillor Squire: Next speaker? Those are the, as I understand it, the public speakers today so I'll need a motion to close the public participation meeting.